

## SEPA/GMA Integration Survey

**Question 1a: Has your jurisdiction implemented (or started the process of implementing) for: Integrated GMA Plan/SEPA Document**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	32.4%	22
No	67.6%	46
Name of Plan, Year Completed (or "In progress") and contact person for more information		24
<i>answered question</i>		<b>68</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>30</b>

### 1a - Responses:

1. 1999 Comprehensive Plan included an integrated EIS; subsequent 2006 mandatory update also included the EIS.
2. We have done separate EIS, SEIS, or SEPA Addenda separate from the comprehensive plan or comprehensive plan update.
3. Town Center plan
4. GMA plan and SEPA EIS were combined in 1994.
5. West Arlington plan is integrating GMA and SEPA, but we are in initial stages and seeking a grant to assist with the process
6. 2005 Comprehensive Plan Amendments (EIS), 2006,
7. Burien Comprehensive Plan, 1997,
8. NERA Master Plan, 2010,
9. Revised County Code (CCC 40.570) SEPA to be consistent with WAC 197-11-210, 220, 228, 230, and 232.
10. Downtown Kent Strategic Action Plan (DSAP) and Integrated Environmental Impact Statement - 1998; Update to DSAP - 2005
11. Comprehensive Plan 1999, 2002, 2004, 2007, 2009
12. NW Gateway Master Plan now underway 2010.
13. Might consider it
14. Integrated SEPA/GMA Report: Skagit County's 2005 GMA Update Proposal, February 17, 2006.
15. Littlerock Road Subarea Plan (1997)
16. Every comprehensive plan volume and update beginning with original GMA adoptions starting in 1995. These are on file with Commerce.
17. Chehalis Comprehensive Plan (draft plan is almost complete - expect review and adoption in 2011)
18. Yakima County Comprehensive Plan (Plan 2015) completed in 1997- updated by mandate in 2007.
19. Spokane County utilized integrated process in development and implementation of our 2001 Comprehensive Plan and Urban Growth Area Boundary
20. We do not plan fully under the Act in Okanogan County.
21. We do not plan under GMA
22. Cheney 2030 Plan Update, In Progress
23. The Comprehensive Plan, Zoning, and Development Regulations adopted in 1993/1994 implements the integration of GMA/SEPA. In addition, HB 1724 was implemented in 1998, and the City of Renton utilizes the Optional DNS process for SEPA.
24. All of our comprehensive planning and community planning is through integrated documents. Started in mid-1990s.
25. Walla Walla County Comprehensive Plan, 2008,

## SEPA/GMA Integration Survey

### Question 1b

Question 1b Has your jurisdiction implemented (or started the process of implementing) for: Planned Action		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	27.9%	19
No	72.1%	49
Name of Plan, Year Completed (or "In progress") and contact person		18
<i>answered question</i>		68
<i>skipped question</i>		30

### 1b - Responses:

1. Southwest Everett Subarea Planned Action, 1995
2. Downtown Everett Subarea Planned Action, 2009
3. Considering it for the SMP update and flood hazard mitigation issues; not sure if all that useful.
4. 1999-2000 adopted the North City (mixed use district) Planned Area.
5. Yesler Terrace Redevelopment, in progress
6. We have a grant application in to Commerce for the West Arlington plan that would use Planned action
7. NERA Master Plan, 2010 Scott Greenberg
8. Revised County Code (CCC 40.570) SEPA to include WAC 197-11-164, 168 and 172.
9. Kent Station Planned Action/Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement - July 2002, also, are in the process of developing PAO for Envision Midway, a subarea of the City in process for City Center and Hwy 99 Corridor
10. Esther Short Redevelopment Area Plan, Vancouver City Center Vision Plan, Fourth Plain Corridor Plan
11. "In Progress"
12. We have done similar things via site specific binding site plans, and PRD's
13. Overlake Neighborhood Plan and BROTS - Bel-Red Overlake Transportation Study, last significantly revised in 2007 last revision
14. Spanish Castle master Planned Resort project 2007.
15. Town Center Subarea Plan and EIS/Planned Action--completed in 2007.
16. The City of Renton has conducted Planned Actions for: Southport; Boeing Sub district 1 B; Lakeshore Landing; and has commenced an EIS for the Sunset Area Planned Action
17. We have not completed any planned actions.
18. Gateway Town Center ( in progress)

### Question 1c

Question 1c: Has your jurisdiction implemented (or started the process of implementing) for: ESHB 2538 Subarea Plan		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	13.4%	9
No	86.6%	58
Name of Plan, Year Completed (or "In progress") and contact person for more information		11
<i>answered question</i>		67
<i>skipped question</i>		31

## SEPA/GMA Integration Survey

### 1c - Responses:

1. Four Corners Sub-area Plan in progress - Summit Place Sub-area Plan 2010
2. Northwest Gateway Master Plan (in progress)
3. Infill development only here at this point; probably not worth the staff effort (that would be me).
4. Point Wells Subarea Plan adopted April of 2010. - SE Shoreline Subarea Plan adopted May of 2010 - Town Center Subarea Plan in progress
5. South Lake Union rezone study, in progress
6. We didn't think Arlington's population was large enough
7. Updated Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element (page1-9) provided for community sub-area plans and Clark County Code Section 40.560.010(P) provided for out-of-cycle amendments for the initial adoption of a subarea plan that does not modify the comprehensive plan policies and designations applicable to the subarea.
8. NW Gateway Master Plan now underway 2010.
9. See above. master planned resorts are a subarea plan.
10. As an Urban Center identified in Vision 2020, the City of Renton adopted Area-wide Zoning and amended the Comprehensive Plan to allow for high-density, compact, infill development and redevelopment within the urban area. This was part of the work conducted in 1993/1994.
11. We have not completed any ESHB 2538 subarea plans.

### Question 1d:

Question 1d: Has your jurisdiction implemented (or started the process of implementing) for: Other (Please specify below)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Other	100.0%	4
Name of Plan, Year Completed (or "In progress") and contact person for more information		4
<i>answered question</i>		<b>4</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>94</b>

### 1d - Responses:

1. No
2. N/A
3. Birchfield FCC in progress - Industrial Park at TransAlta In progress - Cardinal Glass Major Industrial Development 2007
4. Updating our 2001 Comprehensive Land Use Plan. We are updating portions at a time, so a little bit each year.

## SEPA/GMA Integration Survey

### Question 2

Question 2: Is your jurisdiction likely to implement any of the three types of SEPA/GMA processes in the next five years? (Check all that apply.)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Integrated GMA Plan/SEPA Document	37.9%	25
Planned Action	36.4%	24
ESHB 2538 Subarea Plan	36.4%	24
Other (Please specify below)	4.5%	3
No	36.4%	24
Other (please specify)		11
<i>answered question</i>		<b>66</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>32</b>

### 2 - Responses:

1. Only when required
2. We are unlikely to do another planned action due to upfront cost, and unlikely to do a 2538 subarea plan and then attempt to collect from development a portion of the costs, similar to a latecomer utility fee.
3. Will likely select one of these options. The decision has not yet been made.
4. N/A
5. Not a priority at this time, but may consider with future major updates to GMA plans.
6. One aspect or regulatory coordination that has not been adequately addressed is coordination with the Shoreline Management Act and local SMP's
7. Skagit County is required to update its comprehensive plan/development code by 2015; Skagit County is required to update its Shoreline Master Plan by 2013; Envision Skagit 2060
8. We would anticipate using these tools as the situation presents itself. We are beginning a planned action process for an industrial area master plan.
9. Not sure -- Our plan needs a major update
10. We want to at least consider doing more of a SEPA process when we do major review & update of Comp Plan (circa 2014). Also, may want to do either a planned action or a ESHB 2538 type plan within the next 5 years.
11. The City of Renton will be amending the Comprehensive Plan in 2014 to address climate change.

### Question 3

Question 3: If you answered yes to either of the above questions, what factors influenced your jurisdiction's decision to implement a combined planning/environmental review process? (Check all that apply.)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Improve area-wide planning	67.4%	29
Promote economic development	81.4%	35
Reduce permitting costs to developers	62.8%	27
Reduce your jurisdiction's costs	32.6%	14
Shorten permitting timelines	67.4%	29
Increase certainty for developers	74.4%	32
Reduce SEPA appeals	41.9%	18
Ensure that cumulative environmental impacts are mitigated	69.8%	30
Other (please specify)	18.6%	8
<i>answered question</i>		<b>43</b>

## SEPA/GMA Integration Survey

*skipped question*

55

### 3 - Responses:

1. It did not reduce our costs, as the upfront cost to prepare a Planned Action, even with grants, was significant. However, it is a great marketing tool to tell a developer that they will have environmental approval in about a month and there is no possibility of an appeal.
2. Common sense and less paperwork long term
3. We are currently working on a Subarea Plan for the Freeland NMUGA in Island County. The combined planning and environmental review may provide efficiencies for the local review process.
4. In a complex scenario driven analyses we need to understand the full trade offs between various courses of development the jurisdiction may pursue. This approach is best explored within the SEPA GMA integrative framework. This is a public-private planning effort that requires good information on environmental options, transportation costs, and economic benefits to the community as well as to the developers.
5. Addressing both SEPA and GMA at the same time allows for integration and a comprehensive analysis of existing conditions, alternatives, mitigating measures, preferred alternatives, and implementation.
6. SEPA is, frankly, archaic and can cause multiple reviews of the same or similar projects.
7. Permit review staff has been reduced or eliminated - need to have environmental mitigation known/established prior to permit review process.
8. My jurisdiction has not decided to do any of the above. The Integrated GMA Plan/SEPA Document seemed the most likely choice for a city of our size and budget.

### Question 4

**Question 4: Would your jurisdiction be more or less likely to implement combined environmental review/planning processes in the future if the following funding mechanisms were available/authorized to assist with upfront planning costs?**

Answer Options	More likely	Less likely	No more or less likely	Response Count
State-funded loans	9	14	38	61
State-funded grants	59	0	7	66
Cost recovery through fees on subsequent development	30	10	23	63
<i>answered question</i>				66
<i>skipped question</i>				32

### Question 5

**Question 5: Are you aware of other processes or options that would create more certainty in the permitting process and/or make mitigation more effective? (Please describe.)**

Answer Options	Response Count
	26
<i>answered question</i>	26
<i>skipped question</i>	72

## SEPA/GMA Integration Survey

---

### 5 - Responses:

1. No.
2. Better and clearer development standards or mitigation requirements would reduce the need to try to catch impacts and mitigation that a jurisdiction's code otherwise would miss using SEPA.
3. Integrating SEPA and NEPA; most everything these days tosses you into the NEPA world and all the work done for SEPA is junked by superfluous state (WSDOT) and federal (HUD, EPA, you name it!) paperwork and useless bureaucracy. IT STINKS. Something needs to GO.
4. Yes. Planning Commission review and City Council approval of quasi-judicial permits is far less timely, fair, and predictable than the hearing examiner system. Shoreline is moving in the direction of ALL quasi judicial decisions being made by the Hearing Examiner, with appeal to Superior Court.
5. No. Stevenson is not fully planning under GMA as historical development levels have been and remain low. However, we are likely to consider Planned Actions, Mitigation Banks or some of these types of practices in the future.

In order to preserve our ability to do that, I implore you to carefully consider the wording of any policies (legislative or otherwise) that are proposed. In many cases, I believe the words "for jurisdictions planning under RCW 36.70A.040" are misused and make it impossible for jurisdictions like mine to plan in the proactive ways that GMA jurisdictions plan. If policies are written to require something, then please continue to target them at GMA jurisdictions. If policies are written to enable something, then please carefully evaluate whether there is some benefit in not enabling non-GMA jurisdictions as well.

6. Use of form based codes, recognition of locally developed landscape scale plans
7. Use of an administrative or hearing Examiner decision making process instead of City Council decisions on land use permits.
8. N/A
9. If all mitigation measures were codified (not an easy task), then SEPA as a separate process could be eliminated and the permitting/development process would be more predictable, perhaps even faster. However, the SEPA process allows for a customized analysis of environmental factors on each individual site and mitigation, therefore, can be likewise customized to the unique impacts which may occur.
10. No
11. We do not use SEPA as the primary means of determining mitigation. Instead, we have adopted ordinances to protect and mitigate impacts to specific resources - for example an archaeological resource protection ordinance. With the critical areas ordinance, traffic impact/concurrency ordinances, nuisance ordinances, etc. we rarely use SEPA as the vehicle to achieve mitigation. This in itself makes the process more clear and certain for the applicant.
12. Adoption of development regulations that address typical development impacts.
13. Yes, coordination with SMA.
14. Transfer of development rights programs. Mitigation banking
15. No
16. There are other regional options which central Puget Sound communities are using for various aspects - Transportation-GTAC/Environment-Watershed Coordination/Restoration as well as city funded processes - (uses of tree funds for restorative tree canopy concepts that are City-wide which we are interested in pursuing as well). The City is still identifying other sources of potential funding.
17. Use of Binding Site Plan plats, that address more detailed development plans. Planned Commercial Developments, etc that involve detailed development information....etc...
18. In 2005, Skagit County Planning and Development Services contracted with an outside, third party consultant, to conduct an audit to identify ways to improve the permit process predictability, efficiency and collaboration of County service. The audit provided findings and recommendations which led to an improved permitting process.
19. No
20. A fundamental overhaul of SEPA would help. Its framework has not caught up to current trends, economies and technologies. Start with increasing the categorical exemption thresholds, or at least increase the optional levels.
21. None known.

## SEPA/GMA Integration Survey

22. No
23. Integrate development regulations to avoid duplication of regulatory oversight.
24. More options for counties partially planning under the Act.
25. No.
26. Amending SEPA to require mitigation monitoring much like is done under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Having staff with technical expertise (such as biologists) who specialize in wetland/stream/lake issues would help in developing mitigation, and tracking mitigation more effectively.

### Question 6

Question 6: Over the last few years, what other things (if any) has your community done to pre-define development mitigation, reduce time to permit and/or increase certainty for developers?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	35
<i>answered question</i>	35
<i>skipped question</i>	63

### 6 - Responses:

1. The City processes land use permits using the Optional DNS process when appropriate, thereby shortening the review time. We require pre-application meetings and encourage early traffic concurrency review to determine transportation improvements.
2. None. Permit review timeline in this jurisdiction has always been short.
3. We have considered raising the SEPA exemption thresholds, but our public appreciates the public notice the SEPA signs provide, even if the project notice generates no public comment offering substantive comments regarding impacts or mitigation that is applied through SEPA. Current discussion among a few planning directors suggests raising SEPA categorical exemption thresholds above current State law in areas where our comp plans want to encourage infill development. SEPA is often used as a blunt instrument against a development, to either extract an exaction by a sophisticated opponent, or merely to delay a project and attempt to frustrate the proponent.
4. Incentive-based ordinances
5. Discouraged development requiring mitigation
6. Conditions are all very obvious here; only major issues are transportation and we cannot afford to fix it. We have excellent turnaround times and great certainty.
7. We adopted a form-based code for one of our small commercial districts. It established where access could and couldn't occur, an envelope to establish heights/setbacks, and roof form/pitch details on the block face opposite single family homes. We required administrative design review for the permit rather than a quasi-judicial hearing. Our Town Center Plan will use a refined version of form-based code but much more profusely illustrated building and site design standards. It will also replace formulas trading off height for green building features by simply allowing the former as a matter of right and mandating the latter.
8. As part of City's SMP, Seattle adopted a mitigation program that assigns values to environmental functions along shorelines. Those values help quantify the level of impact a project will have and therefore the level of mitigation needed. Project also identifies projects on city-owned shoreline where off-site mitigation can be performed.
9. Moved mitigation fees to time of building permit, one-stop Permit Center process, no fee development review meetings for developers
10. Combination of pre-application meeting for developers with multiple applications. Case management approach to development application. Pre-determination of wetlands and other habitats areas.
11. Kent has adopted traffic impact fees (TIF) in lieu of using SEPA to require traffic corridor assessments. While this has helped predictability, the cost to developers has generally been



## SEPA/GMA Integration Survey

---

increased as a result. Kent has also implemented various permit streamlining processes, including what we call the SMART process. SMART establishes protocols between the City and permit applicant regarding communications and expectations about the processing of the permit application. It is designed to rely on verbal and face-to-face contact between parties in an effort to streamline decision-making.

12. Prompt review by staff
13. In process of adopting traffic impact fees.
14. See above.
15. County land use and environmental codes that adopt development standards that address SEPA environmental elements.
16. Nothing
17. Predefine Development Mitigation: Clear transportation investment expectations through Capital Facilities Planning, Capital Improvements Planning. Sustainable Development concepts are incorporated into each of these so that each transportation project is also a drainage, utilities, and environmental mitigation opportunity. Reduction in time to permit: Clear and well organized predevelopment meetings; clearly working with the land owners from the CIP stage forward as to what the particular district needs will be (as long as those needs are not subject to change). This also assists in promoting certainty. Improving permit timing is accomplished in this scenario since the analyses should factor in the environmental constraints and opportunities.
18. Development codes that permit commercial or even PRD via binding site plans, that can be taken though SEPA in a form that they can be amended or qualify for simple SEPA addendums to be used to permit us to issue development permits,,, ie, helping us promote shovel ready development sites.
19. Adopted a city-wide strategic plan, adopted a new Economic Development Plan, engaged a consultant for permit streamlining.
20. Olympia has created clear timelines and expectations for all participants in the development review process. Olympia has also established and tracked performance measures for its major development review processes.
21. Substantially revised our development review process. Developed pre-submittal process so that applications when made are approvable, rewritten the zoning code, and instituted electronic plan review and a new permit tracking system.
22. Good development regulations, consistent and equitable administration.
23. Created regional storm water facilities in the City's commercial area to reduce the time and cost to implement the DOE requirements
24. Adopt prescriptive and performance based CAO and DR's.
25. We are updating codes, ILAs with the cities
26. None.
27. Keep current on GMA as directed by DOC
28. Energy Overlay Zone
29. We have updated many of our code chapters to be more specific and clear--and at the same time, to encourage compact development that ultimately reduces sprawl and greenhouse gases.
30. Encourage pre-application meetings, with a detailed letter as follow-up.
31. Refined development regulations
32. Nothing.
33. Streamlined permit process.
34. We have codified standard SEPA conditions so that projects can achieve a DNS. We have raised our SEPA exemption level to exempt developments of 9 or fewer dwelling units.  
Renton also offers a free pre-application meeting to prospective developers in order to help them understand the process, regulations, and potential mitigation.
35. Pre submission conferences that provide as much detail as possible. Consolidate or run concurrent permit reviews where applicable.